MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL POLICY CONSENSUS CENTER
Hatfield School Of Government

TO: Mid-Coast IR TMDL Sediment Technical Working Group Members
FROM: Peter Harkema, Oregon Consensus (OC)
SUBJECT: DRAFT – Action Items from September 18 Meeting – DRAFT
DATE: October 4, 2012

This memo follows up on the September 18, 2012, meeting of the Mid-Coast Implementation Ready Total Maximum Daily Load (IR TMDL) Sediment Technical Working Group (TWG), held at the Siuslaw Valley Fire & Rescue in Florence, Oregon. The memo includes the following: proposed future meeting dates, identified action items and brief summaries of key topics discussed.

Upcoming Meetings
Please take note and calendar the following meetings.

Meeting	Date	Location
TWG Meeting (Sediment and Bacteria	Bacteria - October 16, 2012 (afternoon) Sediment October 17, 2012 (3/4 day)	Newport *(Specific location TBD)*
LSAC Meeting 7 and TWG meetings	November 13 - 14, 2012 *(tentative)*	TBD
LSAC Meetings 10 - 14 *TWG Meetings*	*December 2012 – November 2013* *(see Meeting Schedule & Workplan)*	*TBD*

Action Items

Action Item	Who	Date
1. Action Items • Prepare draft Action Items memo and distribute to TWG members for review	OC (Peter) with DEQ	Complete
2. Information Follow-up • Post presentations and meeting documents to project website	DEQ	By cob, October 5

3. Information Sharing • Send coastal zone on-site (septic) system time-of-transfer inspection rulemaking information to TWG	DEQ (Karen)	By cob, October 5
4. Potential Sediment Sources • Provide any relevant information (e.g. studies, data, etc.) that should be evaluated to determine potential sources of sediment (e.g. timber harvest units, bank/channel and hazelnut farms)	TWG members to Josh S.	Strive for in advance of October meeting
5. Roads • Distribute roads integration document for group review and consideration • Continue to work on forest roads; schedule a second meeting, as needed • Schedule first meeting of Agricultural Road Subgroup; Hold meeting ASAP • Contact Public Roads Subgroup members and schedule first meeting for November	Josh S. Forest roads subgroup member (Josh – lead) Josh S. Josh S.	In advance of October meeting Ongoing In advance of October meeting In advance of October meeting

Sediment TWG Members Present: Stephen Hager (Siuslaw Watershed Council), Mike Buren (ODF), Daren Cone (ODF), Stan van de Wetering (Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians), Kate Danks (NRCS), Hui Rodomsky (Salmon-Drift Creek Watershed Council), Wayne Hoffman (MidCoast Watersheds Council), Randy Hereford (Starker Forests), Kami Ellingson (USFS), Richard Huff (private landowner), Maryanne Reiter (Weyerhaeuser), Peter Adams (BLM), Dan Avery (ODFW-OCCCP), Glen Spain (PCFFA)

Project Team Members Present: David Waltz, Ryan Michie, Gene Foster, Karen Tarnow, Josh Seeds, Pam Blake (DEQ); Alan Henning (EPA); Jessie Conover (Oregon Consensus)

Other Attendees: Susan Shaw (Weyerhaeuser), Jeff Lockwood (NOAA Fisheries), Jeff Light (Plum Creek), Paul Engelmeyer (Native Fish Society), Mary Scurlock (M. Scurlock and Associates), Kevin Fenn (ODA)

Facilitation: Peter Harkema (Oregon Consensus)

Meeting Notes

Key topics and themes:

During the third meeting of the Mid-Coast TMDL Sediment TWG, attendees: (1) heard a review of the Sediment TMDL source assessment approach; (2) heard an update on and discussed the landslide prone areas methodology; (3) heard an overview of and briefly discussed the draft integrative document for roads; (3) heard a report-out and discussed the proposed metrics and ideas from the Forest Roads Subgroup; and (4) discussed the membership of the Agricultural

and Public Roads Sub-Groups. The meeting agenda and meeting materials (including PowerPoint presentations) will be available through the DEQ Mid-Coast TMDL project website at: (http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/midcoast.htm).

Stakeholder Questions, Issues, Concerns and Agency Responses

Macroinvertebrate assessment overview:

The project team distributed a written memo to attendees and gave a brief update on current aquatic macroinvertebrate assessment fieldwork partially in response to questions raised at previous meetings, and explained that detailed discussion of the use of biomonitoring data and analysis methodology in relation to sediment impairments will be addressed in detail at the October Sediment TWG meeting.

TWG participants asked a variety of detailed questions about the macroinvertebrate assessment methodology and application to current sediment listings and TMDLs. One member asked whether continuous temperature monitoring was being conducted and noted that the IMST critique indicated that it might be important to have temperature data to evaluate whether the primary stressor was temperature vs. sediment. Others wondered whether pebble counts had been taken. DEQ explained that no physical channel metrics were taken; however, there is data at some of the sites from the previous RBS study. Another member expressed concerns about potential sampling location bias in Elk Creek towards areas below major tributaries where gravel/cobble is deposited along with cooler water inputs because Big Elk is mostly bedrock (stronger signal). DEQ noted that all the sites are chosen from a random pool of sites but there tends to be more sampling on public lands due to limitations with complex ownerships and receiving permission to access private property.

Some TWG members had concerns about the current sediment listings and subsequent DEQ assessment work. These concerns included: the need for "better front end information"; the application of the narrative standard to sedimentation; and whether the application of the narrative standard to sediment listings meant DEQ set a new standard. DEQ briefly explained that there are listings based on the narrative standard throughout Oregon. DEQ clarified that the goal of the biomonitoring assessment methodology is not to generate a numeric criteria, which requires a rulemaking process. The biomonitoring assessment methodology is a quantitative way to interpret the narrative standard, so DEQ can assess whether there is a deleterious impact on beneficial uses, which is aquatic life in this case. DEQ emphasized that these topics will be covered during the October meeting.

Additional topics/questions raised by the group included: the role of the TWG in source assessment; where biomonitoring is used as a tool in process; the process for reassessment of those watersheds with sedimentation listings; establishing in-stream targets. Several questions were directly or indirectly related to how the biomonitoring data can be used in the source assessment process. In particular, TWG members observed that, based on current TMDL schedules, the biomonitoring data will be available after TMDL development is completed. One TWG member expressed that it is unclear how the TWG's role fits in with the current DEQ biomonitoring project, since the TWG wasn't involved in project design and the data will not be available for some time to address the listings. A few TWG members also expressed concern about how DEQ would be making linkages to the prior Relative Bed Stability (RBS) assessment work.

DEQ explained that a significant portion of the October Sediment TWG meeting will be devoted to an in-depth presentation and discussion of the use of macroinvertebrate data in determining

stream condition and the data analysis methods used to assess whether sediment is a cause of impairments.

Review of Sediment TMDL source assessment approach:

Josh S. reviewed the source assessment approach for the Sediment TMDL in response to questions raised at the last TWG meeting. Josh S. also characterized the TWG's progress. The group heard and discussed the various sources of information that DEQ is using to build the Sediment TMDL source assessment. The draft forest roads approach is a significant step in the process and will help answer a number of the questions described in the TWG process flowchart. See: (http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/tmdls/docs/midcoast/Advisory/20120620SedimentTMDLprocessMap.pdf).

Participants asked whether sediment generated from timber harvest operations would be a part of the TMDL process. DEQ responded that it has not planned to include sediment from timber harvest areas in the source assessment but would consider looking at additional information on this topic. Instead, the focus is on maintaining and improving the structure and function of riparian areas. TWG members were encouraged to share information on any potential sources, including timber harvest units, with the DEQ project team and TWG.

In response to a question about removing segments from the 303(d) list through the TMDL process, DEQ responded that if stakeholder groups have information that would demonstrate that a change in management practices has resulted in water quality improvements in impaired areas that those groups can send that information to DEQ (Josh and Ryan), along with the associated QA/QC procedures.

Landslide Prone Areas Update Discussion:

Ryan M. provided an update on the landslide prone area analysis, including information about data coverage and two possible shallow landslide screening approaches. DEQ informed the TWG that LiDAR data has been delivered to DEQ and DOGAMI is currently working on the landslide inventory. The inventory on the North Fork Siuslaw is almost complete and currently going through QA/QC process. The inventory on Big Elk Creek is estimated to be available in December 2012 or January 2013. It was noted that DEQ can make the DOGAMI inventory methodology available if it would be helpful to TWG members. A TWG member asked whether large earthflows are considered a "background" source, and DEQ confirmed that it is.

TWG members briefly discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the two approaches, which were the Factor of Safety Approach [PISA-m] and Geomorphic Approach. Suggestions from the group included doing a congruency test to compare the two approaches and importance of incorporating local climatic conditions. The group clarified that the geomorphic approach is first a screening model based on slope angle and shape (concave/convex/ planer). Use of both screening approaches may require an on-site evaluation to determine whether the slope is a high risk for mass movement. At least one TWG member noted that the PISA-m model cannot adequately predict shallow landslides, which generally are, the only ones that human activities influence. Also, shallow landslides are the primary focus of the CZARA management measures being addressed in the TMDLs. Other TWG members suggested that it would be important to evaluate the relationship between past slope failures that led to sediment contributions to the watershed and modeling of potential future landslides as a sediment source. Other TWG members suggested that DEQ should use the Geomorphic Approach because PISA-m looks uses many variables that are unknown.. Some TWG members inquired whether PISA-m considers climate and rainfall. DEQ explained that there is a variable included for saturated

soils.

A TWG member asked if using a screening tool could help determine management actions and link past failures to current listings. DEQ explained that the proposed screening tools provide information on areas that are potentially susceptible to landslides and may determine certain management actions on those slopes after a more site specific investigation occurs. The landslide screen and inventory could provide information to put the current listings in context with the landslide activity but additional information and analysis may be needed to link past failures to the current listings.. DEQ has not made a final decision on which screening approach DEQ will use TWG members' comments along with those of other geotechnical professionals in the selection of the approach. DEQ will provide the TWG with an update on the landslide approach after completion of roads work and temperature is further along. There will be an opportunity for additional feedback and discussion at that point.

Integrative Roads Document Review:

Josh S. described an integrative roads document that is in development. The integrative roads document will preface road-type specific approaches (Forest, Agricultural, and Public Roads) and provide common information applicable to all roads approaches. The document will capture any information that is not sufficiently described in the three road-type sections. The document is intended also to provide direction on roads not discussed in the road-type specific approaches. Also, the document will provide a process to clarify who is the responsible party for roads where management responsibility is currently unclear. The TWG then discussed which road types to include in the Public Roads approach. There was a suggestion to clarify that the draft road integration document is to be applied where sediment problems occur to make clear that the scope is limited to areas that are listed as impaired due to sediment. Josh noted that the draft document includes the geographic extent. DEQ will distribute a draft of the integrative roads document to TWG member for their review and comment after reviews by the Project Team.

Forest Roads Subgroup Report-out and Other Sub-Groups:

Josh S. and members of the Forest Roads Subgroup reported the preliminary results of their first meeting. In addition to TWG members in the group (Kami E., Daren C., Richard H.), Jerry Anderson of Hancock Timber and Peter Adams of BLM participated in the meeting. There was considerable discussion about the reporting metrics drafted by the Subgroup and how that would relate to existing inventory protocols, as well as timelines and management plans. TWG members asked a number of questions and provided feedback on several topics that included:

- Whether and how geographic location data should be gathered and included in the inventory
- How verification will conducted to ensure completion of identified actions
- Need for common definitions on terms used in the reporting form
- Potential need for targets and protocols
- Consideration of road types, including legacy roads
- Whether DEQ will review plans
- How best to prioritize action schedules ("worst first", "worst first in current area of operation", or another approach)

The Forest Roads Subgroup will continue to meet and refine the approached introduced at this meeting.

The TWG briefly discussed membership on the other roads subgroups, and determined that it

would be useful to have a forest road expert in the Agricultural and Public Roads Subgroups because of the high degree of crossover between the road types.

Agricultural Roads Subgroup Members

- Wayne H.
- Jim W.
- Kevin F.
- Richard H.
- Stephen H. (or designee)
- Daren C.

Public Roads Subgroup Members

- Wayne H.
- Daren C.
- Additional members from ODOT and counties and/or cities